

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending when last examined. With this Response, Applicant has cancelled Claims 5 and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer, amended Claims 1 and 11, and added new Claims 21-27. All pending claims are shown in the detailed listing above.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitations disclosed in claims 2-10 and 12-20 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Applicants respectfully request that this objection be held in abeyance until the claims have been allowed in the present Application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner states, “Regarding claims 5 and 15, the limitations disclosed in the body of the claim does not provide a clear indication of the claim. For example: step 1 states: ‘accessing a stored telephone number’: the application does not disclose in the claim where the telephone number would have been accessed from; step 3 states: ‘receiving a numeric identification code’: the applicant fails to teach or show the destination and the recipient of the numeric identification code.”

Claims 5 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,324). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1, as amended, recites *inter alia*, “accessing a stored telephone number from the target computer; dialing the telephone number to call a user at the remote computer; receiving at the central computer system a numeric identification code from the user; comparing the numeric identification code to a stored numeric identification code; and allowing the remote computer to access the target computer if the received numeric identification code matches the stored identification code.” Such limitations are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Slaughter, III et al. and Ogram, taken separately or in combination. As such, the cited references does not make obvious Applicants’ invention recited in Claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and this claim be allowed. Furthermore, because each of Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 10 depend from Claim 1 and include further limitations, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and these dependent claims be allowed.

Similarly, Claim 11, as amended, recites *inter alia*, “accessing a stored telephone number from the target computer; dialing the telephone number to call a user at the remote computer; receiving at the central computer system a numeric identification code from the user; comparing the numeric identification code to a stored numeric identification code; and allowing the remote computer to access the target computer if the received numeric identification code matches the stored identification code.” Such limitations are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Slaughter, III et al. and Ogram, taken separately or in combination. As such, the cited references does not make obvious Applicants’ invention recited in Claim 11.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and this claim be allowed. Furthermore, because each of Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, and 20 depend from Claim 11 and include further limitations, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and these dependent claims be allowed.

Claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,324), and further in view of Crawford (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,354). Applicants respectfully traverse.

These claims depend from Claims 1 and 11, respectively, which as discussed above should be in condition for allowance. Claims 2 and 12 also include further limitations. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and these dependent claims be allowed.

Claims 5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,324), and further in view of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,145,083).

As already discussed, Claims 5 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering moot any rejection of these claims.

Claims 8 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,324), and further in view of "Official Notice".

These claims depend from Claims 1 and 11, respectively, which as discussed above should be in condition for allowance. Claims 8 and 18 also include further limitations. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and these dependent claims be allowed.

Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,324), and further in view of Bates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,184,886 B1).

These claims depend from Claims 1 and 11, respectively, which as discussed above should be in condition for allowance. Claims 9 and 19 also include further limitations. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and these dependent claims be allowed.

New Claims

New Claims 21-27 have been added. Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims are fully supported by the Application as filed, add no new matter, and are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7428.

Certificate of Mailing

Respectfully submitted,

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

April 29, 2005

Date

Richard A. Park

Signature

By:



Philip W. Woo
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,880
PWW/rp

April 29, 2005

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715
(415) 772-7200